UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/660,013	09/11/2003	Dustin C. Kirkland	AUS920030632US1	5894

35525 7590 08/10/2007

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
LY, ANH	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2162	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
08/10/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/660,013	KIRKLAND ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Anh Ly	2162	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *11 June 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office action is response to Applicants' AMENDMENT filed on 06/11/2007.

2. Claim 15 has been added.

3. Claims 1-15 are pending in this Application.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 06/11/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that, "Claim 14 recites clearly functional descriptive material ... the functional descriptive material of claim 14 is recorded on "some" computer-readable medium ... the term "some" means "any" computer-readable medium ... as long as the functional descriptive material is in "some" computer-readable medium, it should be considered statutory." (page 6, the first and second paragraphs, the remarks/arguments).

Examiner respectfully disagrees as argued. In response to Applicants arguments, in the instant specification, computer-readable medium or media supports both recordable-type media, such as floppy disk, hard disk drive, and transmission-type media, such as such as digital and analog communications links, wired or wireless communications links using transmission forms, such as, for example, radio frequency and light wave transmissions, which is non-statutory subject matter. (spec. page 18, the third paragraph).

Applicants argued that, "Schneider fails to teaches the feature of receiving a search statement as a result of a user input, where the search statements includes a universal resource identifier and a regular expression." (page 7, the 8th, paragraph, page 8, the last paragraph, and page 9, the first paragraph, the remarks/arguments).

Examiner respectfully disagrees as argued. In response to Applicants arguments, Schneider teaches receiving input statement or a search string including an expression being used to match against the database server (figs. 2a and 2b, col. 18, lines 35-45 and fig. 210 in 2b; also, col. 4, lines 30-56 and col. 32, lines 45-55). The search string may be a string such as http://example.com to get the URI "http://www.example.com (col. 10, lines 5-10).

Applicants argued that, "Schneider fails to teaches the feature of parsing the retrieved universal resource identifiers for the regular expression to form search results." (page 9, the second paragraph and page 10, the last paragraph, the remarks/arguments).

Examiner respectfully disagrees as argued. In response to Applicants arguments, Schneider teaches after retrieving the URI from a matching. A valid URI or retrieved URI is calculated and re-generated from the parsed (figs. 2s', 7-9, and col. 30, lines 38-45).

Applicants argued that, "Schneider fails to teaches the feature of not retrieved universal resource identifiers, as recited in claims 5 and 12." (page 11, the 4th paragraph, the remarks/arguments).

Examiner respectfully disagrees as argued. In response to Applicants arguments, Schneider teaches a table of contents of generated or retrieved URI as search result as shown in fig, 13, , col. 30, lines 22-28).

For the above reasons, Examiner believed that rejection of the last Office action was proper.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Patent No.: US 7,136,932 B1 issued to Schneider.

With respect to claim 1, Schneider teaches a method in a data processing system for searching for Web pages within a Web site (a system for searching web pages from one of search engines to locate web pages or hits within a Web site from clients (item 110): see fig. 1a and 1b, and col. 17, lines 34-44; also col. 10, lines 58-67), the method comprising:

receiving a search statement as a result of a user input, wherein the search statement includes a universal resource identifier and a regular expression (receiving the input search request or search or query string including URI or string of characters for identifying an abstract or physical resource from the client of the system: see fig. 2a, col. 4, lines 30-56 and col. 18, lines 30-56);

retrieving universal resource identifiers associated with the universal resource identifier in the request to form retrieved universal resource identifiers (retrieving from a

database to generate valid URIs based on the search string: fig. 16 and col. 34, lines 18-32);

parsing the retrieved universal resource identifiers for the regular expression to form search results (parsing retrieved URIs via a parsing schema: see fig. 2b, item 260 and 2a, item 210: col. 21, lines 48-63; also col. 30, lines 30-42 and col. 18, lines 30-55); and

returning the search results, wherein the search results include a list of universal resource identifiers associated with the Web pages within the Web site (the result of the search is displayed (item 222 in fig. 2a) and as a list of valid URIs (fig. 13): col. 30, lines 22-30 and col. 18, lines 40-55).

With respect to claim 2, Schneider teaches wherein the search results are returned as a Web page, wherein the universal resource identifiers are presented as a set of links, wherein selection of a link within the set of links causes a Web page identified by the link to be retrieved (the result is a list of URI or a set of web pages, which is also a hyperlinks: fig. 13, col. 30, lines 22-30; also see col. 17, lines 35-45 and col. 18, lines 5-12).

With respect to claim 3, Schneider teaches wherein the regular expression is separated from the universal resource identifier by a delimiter (delimiters in the search string: fig. 18, col. 39-55; col. 19, lines 45-65 and col. 35, lines 58-67).

With respect to claim 4, Schneider teaches wherein the universal resource identifier is a domain name (paring the search string including domain name: col. 18, lines 40-67 and col. 19, lines 1-20).

With respect to claim 5, Schneider teaches wherein the parsing step includes: searching a table of contents for a match to the regular expression, wherein the table of contents contains the retrieved universal resource identifiers (a table of generated URIs: fig. 13).

With respect to claim 6, Schneider teaches wherein retrieving, parsing, and returning steps are performed by a server hosting a Web site identified by the universal identifier, a proxy server, or a client at which the user input was entered (parsing and returning the result from a web server and proxy server: col. 22, lines 8-67 and col. 25, lines 27-52).

Claim 7 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a data processing system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 8 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a data processing system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

Claim 9 is essentially the same as claim 2 except that it is directed to a data processing system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 2 hereinabove.

Claim 10 is essentially the same as claim 3 except that it is directed to a data processing system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 3 hereinabove.

Claim 11 is essentially the same as claim 4 except that it is directed to a data processing system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 4 hereinabove.

Claim 12 is essentially the same as claim 5 except that it is directed to a data processing system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 5 hereinabove.

Claim 13 is essentially the same as claim 6 except that it is directed to a data processing system rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 6 hereinabove.

Claim 14 is essentially the same as claim 1 except that it is directed to a computer program product rather than a method, and is rejected for the same reason as applied to the claim 1 hereinabove.

With respect to claim 15, Schneider teaches a method in a data processing system for searching for Web pages within a Web site (a system for searching web pages from one of search engines to locate web pages or hits within a Web site from clients (item 110), client side browsers, such as Netscape Navigator or Microsoft Internet Explorer with GUI: see fig. 1a and 1b, and col. 17, lines 34-44; also col. 10, lines 58-67; also col. 3, lines 60-65), the method comprising:

receiving a search statement from a user at a client browser, wherein the search statement includes a universal resource identifier and a regular expression (receiving the input search request or search or query string including URI or string of characters for identifying an abstract or physical resource from the client of the system: see fig. 2a,

col. 4, lines 30-56 and col. 18, lines 30-56; also, figs. 2a and 2b, col. 18, lines 35-45 and fig. 210 in 2b; also, col. 4, lines 30-56 and col. 32, lines 45-55). The search string may be a string such as http://example.com to get the URI "http://www.example.com (col. 10, lines 5-10);

in response to receiving the search statement at the client browser, sending a request, by the client browser, to a server to retrieve a table of contents, wherein the table of contents comprises universal resource identifiers associated with the universal resource identifier in the request (figs. 2s, 4s and 13: the input from client's web browser having GUI to receiving the input request or input string or search string as an expression including URI to against the database server and the output is a search result with a table of list of retrieved URIs that match the entered search string: col. 19, lines 65-67, col. 20, lines 1-32, and col. 30,, lines 22-28);

receiving the table contents from the server (the search result of the search as shown in the fig. 13 with generated URI: col. 30, lines 22-28);

parsing the universal resource identifiers in the received table of contents for the regular expression, by the client browser, to form search results (figs. 2s', 7-9, and col. 30, lines 38-45; parsing retrieved URIs via a parsing schema: see fig. 2b, item 260 and 2a, item 210: col. 21, lines 48-63; also col. 30, lines 30-42 and col. 18, lines 30-55); and

displaying the search results to the user, wherein the search results include a list of universal resource identifiers associated with the Web pages within the Web site (the result of the search is displayed (item 222 in fig. 2a) and as a list of valid URIs (fig. 13):

col. 30, lines 22-30 , col. 4, lines 10-15, col. 18, lines 40-50 and fig. 5, col. 24, lines 45-65).

Conclusion

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Contact Information

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should directed to ANH LY, whose telephone number is (571) 272-4039 or via e-mail: ANH.LY@USPTO.GOV (**written authorization being given by Applicant(s) - MPEP 502.03 [R-2]**) or fax to (571) 273-4039 (examiner's personal fax number).

The examiner can normally be reached on TUESDAY – THURSDAY from 8:30 AM – 3:30 PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **John Breene,** can be reached on **(571) 272-4107.**

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231, or faxed to:

Central Fax Center: (571) 273-8300

ANH LY
AUG. 4th, 2007

SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER